REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 10-13 have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application.

Substantive matters

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yildiz (U.S. Patent 6,674,738 B1).

The rejection of claims 10-13 is moot, in view of the present cancellation of those claims.

The rejection of claims 1-9 is respectfully traversed, in view of the following remarks.

(A): General comments regarding Applicant's claimed invention in comparison with the teachings of the Yildiz reference

Applicant's invention is directed to efficient transmission of data to a given target address for the purpose of improving throughput in a wireless network. Applicant's disclosure specifically describes a method that, while satisfying the IEEE 802.11 standard, improves throughput by concatenating messages that are sent to the same target address; Applicant's claims describe variations on how to concatenate frames being sent to the same target address, and doing so in a manner that does not run afoul of the requirements for a 802.11 wireless local area network (LAN) system. Applicant's invention modifies the operation of a standard 802.11 wireless device without violating system requirements or causing additional message errors.

The Yildiz reference, by contrast, is primarily concerned with decoding and

analyzing captured frames in an IEEE 802.11 wireless local area network (LAN), which is generally not relevant to the purpose of Applicant's claimed invention.

(2) Remarks concerning specific claim rejections:

(a) Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicant offers the following remarks in refutation of Examiner's assertions as to the purported teachings of the Yildiz reference:

In an attempt to support the assertion that Yildiz teaches all of the limitations of Applicant's claim 1, Examiner has made several citations to the text and figures of that reference reference. Applicant respectfully notes that nowhere in the cited excerpts, considered both individually and collectively, does Yildiz disclose or suggest Applicant's steps (as recited in claim 1) of buffering a set of messages, identifying a target address for the set of messages , and concatenating the set of messages based on the target address. More particularly:

(i) Regarding Examiner's citation to col. 7, line 56 through col. 8, line 36 of Yildiz, as well as FIG. 1 of Yildiz, Applicant notes that Yildiz is merely referring to the normal method for transmitting frames that are formatted on a channel in accordance with the 802.11 standard. Applicant respectfully notes that a stated primary purpose of Applicant's present invention is to enhance the efficiency of (and thereby introduce modifications to) existing approaches that comport with 802.11 standard.

(ii) Regarding Examiner's citation to col. 9, line 34 through col. 10, line 45 of Yildiz, Applicant notes that Yildiz is merely referring to what appears to be conventional frame formatting in accordance with the 802.11 standard. Applicant's invention, by contrast, is directed to concatenating messages that are targeted to same destination address, so as to avoid

having to send multiple 802.11 packets (thereby saving the overhead associated with duplicate header frames). Applicant's disclosure provides specific teachings as to what is concatenated and what is preserved in each concatenated message.

(iii) Regarding Examiner's citation to col. 12, lines 13-19, Applicant respectfully notes that this cited portion of Yildiz has little, if anything, to with Applicant's recitations regarding concatenating messages based on a common target address. Quite to the contrary, the cited portion of Yildiz refers only to address matching and to checking for multicast and broadcast messages for purposes of determining/validating that those messages originated in the same BSS; that is, Yildiz's approach is to use address matching verify that the target address in a particular BSS.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that it should be quite apparent to Examiner that the limitations of independent claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Yildiz reference. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is deemed to be allowable.

(b) Claims 2-9 are dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus include all limitations of claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-9 are allowable on the same substantive basis as independent claim 1. Moreover, claims 2-9 include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the cited prior art. Accordingly, claims 2-9 are likewise deemed to be allowable.

(c) With further regard to claim 2, Examiner has asserted that Yildiz' teachings regarding a process for evaluating and assembling data segments based on the message headers are somehow equivalent to Applicant's sub-steps (as recited in claim 2) for the step of concatenation. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Applicant's invention, as recited in claim 2

(in dependence upon claim 1), the sync interval is eliminated and the messages are concatenated; that is, in Applicant's invention, by contrast with the teachings of Yildiz, there is no assembling of data segments based upon the message headers. Applicant's invention simply eliminates the sync header for each message sent to same target address. Thus, claim 2 is further allowable on this basis.

It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 are distinct and nonobvious over the Yildiz, and are therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On September 22, 2007
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 09/22/2007
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

Michael H. Retzer, et al.

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 22 September 2007
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
MOTOROLA, INC.
Phone: (847) 576-1974
FAX: (847) 576-0721